



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

1/12

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,650	10/17/2000	Mike Krivoruchko		3571

28390 7590 10/23/2002

MEDTRONIC AVE, INC.
3576 UNOCAL PLACE
SANTA ROSA, CA 95403

EXAMINER

MATTHEWS, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3738	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/691,650	KRIVORUCHKO ET AL.
Period for Reply	Examiner	Art Unit
	William H. Matthews (Howie)	3738
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 		
Status		
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 July 2002</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>		
Disposition of Claims		
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>15-19</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>		
Application Papers		
<p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.</p> <p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</p>		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
<p>13)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p>1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p>2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p>3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p> <p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p> <p>14)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.</p> <p>15)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.</p>		
Attachment(s)		
<p>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.</p> <p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		

Information Disclosure Statement

Claims 15-19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 7.

Drawings

1. The subject matter of this application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Applicant is required to furnish a drawing under 37 CFR 1.81. No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing. In particular, a drawing of the coupling member selectively coupling the valve relief to the outer shaft of claim 7 requires a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention by clarifying which element is the coupling member and how "selectively coupling" is achieved in the invention. Furthermore, the hemostatic valve (page 7, lines 6-11) is not shown in the drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitations "a coupling member" and "a valve relief" are not clearly described in the specification. "A coupling member" is not disclosed in the

specification and the drawings provide no reference to such an element. Furthermore, the function of “selectively coupling” lacks proper explanation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 6, 8-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Braunschweiler et al. (U.S. PN 5,484,444).

Braunschweiler et al. discloses a stent delivery device having inner and outer reciprocating shafts (2,3), stent receiving area (region B), tapered tip (15), handles with moveable knobs connected to both shafts for manipulating reciprocal motion (5,6), stent having plurality of segments at differing radial positions when unexpanded (1), stent stops (8,14), and radiopaque markers on the inner shaft located on the stent stops (8,14). See figures 1-4 and line 60 of column 3 to line 27 of column 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Braunschweiler et al. (U.S. PN 5,484,444) in view of Lenker et al. (U.S. PN 5,683,451).

Braunschweiler et al. discloses a stent delivering device meeting the limitations of claims 2-5 as described above, except Braunschweiler et al. lacks a channel member defining a plurality of channels extending the length of the lumen between inner and outer shafts. Lenker et al. teaches a stent delivery device having channel members defining a plurality of channels along the length of the catheter body in order to provide more column strength while maintaining flexibility (see figures 13 and 14 and lines 30-40 of column 9). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Braunschweiler et al. stent delivery device to include the channel members, as taught by Lenker et al., along the length of the catheter body in order to increase column strength while maintaining flexibility.

With further regard to claim 4, Lenker et al. does not expressly disclose a channel member providing eight channels. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a channel member defining eight channels because Applicant has not disclosed that a channel member defining eight channels provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with seven channels taught by Lenker et al. (see figure 13) because multiple channels provide sufficient column strength and flexibility. Furthermore, Applicant has stated in lines 16-17 on page 7 of the specification that "any suitable number of channels may be chosen".

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to further modify the stent delivery device of Braunschweiler et al. as modified by Lenker et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Braunschweiler et al. (U.S. PN 5,484,444) in view of Williams et al. (U.S. PN 5,391,172).

Braunschweiler et al. meets the limitations of claim 7 as described above, but lacks a coupling member for coupling a valve relief to the outer shaft. Williams et al. teaches a stent delivery system having a valve relief (not shown) attached to the outer sheath by coupling member (250) to prevent blood from collecting and coagulating within the annulus between the inner and outer catheters (see abstract and line 60 of column 3 to line 17 of column 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the stent delivery device taught by Braunschweiler et al. to include a coupling member for attaching a valve relief in order to prevent blood from collecting and coagulating within the annulus between the inner and outer catheters.

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Braunschweiler et al. (U.S. PN 5,484,444) in view of Lange et al. (U.S. PN 6,036,682). Braunschweiler et al. meets the limitations of claim 13 as described above, but lacks the specific disclosure of placing the radiopaque marker on the distal end of the outer shaft.

Lange et al. teaches catheter for dilation of narrowed vessels having radiopaque markers on an outer shaft in order to assist the surgeon with viewing positions of the catheter or measuring internal dimensions (see abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the stent delivery device taught by Braunschweiler et al. to include radiopaque markers, as taught by Lange et al., on an outer shaft in order to assist the surgeon with viewing position of the catheter or measuring internal dimensions.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed July 16, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Drawings

The Examiner acknowledges the presence of a valve relief in figure 2. However, as described in the previous office action and clarified above in paragraph 1, the coupling member is unclear and the method of selectively coupling the valve relief is unclear.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Applicant did not respond to the rejection of claim 7 in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Applicant argues that the Braunschweiler et al. ('444) reference "does not disclose a single means coupled to both the inner and outer shaft." The '444 reference

discloses means coupled to both shafts. Both handles and shafts are coupled together in a telescopic manner.

Regarding arguments pertaining to the handle and knob (claims 8-9), figure 4 shows elements 5 and 6 structurally fulfilling these limitations.

Regarding arguments pertaining to claim 14, figures 3 and 3a clearly show two sets of stent segments in separate radial positions when the stent is in the unexpanded configuration.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Regarding claims 2-5, Applicant argues that "Lenker fails to disclose a channel member "between" the inner shaft and the outer shaft." Figures 13-14 shows an outer shaft having an internal channel member which would lie between the outer shaft and inner shaft.

Regarding claim 7, the Applicant contends that neither Williams et al. '172 or Braunschweiler et al. '444 provide the particular elements for the same intended use or function as the Applicant's invention. Only structural limitations are required and these structural features would have been obvious to include in the Braunschweiler et al. device as described above.

Regarding claim 13, Applicant argues that Lange '682 does not teach the functional aspect of the current application. As described in the previous office action in paragraph 14, Lange '682 teaches motivation for providing the radiopaque markers of Braunschweiler on the outer shaft. The purpose or function of the result of adding

radiopaque markers to the outer shaft is not critical to whether the structural limitations are met by the references.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Matthews (Howie) whose telephone number is 703-305-0316. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00-4:30 (Every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 703-308-2111. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Art Unit: 3738

308-2708 for regular communications and (703) 305-3590 for After Final
communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-
0858.

WHR

WHM
October 21, 2002



CORRINE McDERMOTT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700